

each. Luxembourg \$2.06 each and for the Swedes \$1.57 each. The U.S. per capita cost for 16 U.N. peacekeeping operations in 1994 was less than \$4.

Making matters worse is the U.S. arrogance when discussing problems of U.N. peacekeeping, especially regarding the U.N. troops in the former Yugoslavia, and the disavowal of Washington, particularly Congress, for America's part in the "failure" of the U.N. in the Balkans. The real facts regarding the limitations of U.N. peacekeeping in the post-Cold War period is a shameful record of "great power" mismanagement and unrealistic mandates. The vast majority of U.N. Troops in peacekeeping missions are from such member states as Fiji, Pakistan, Malaysia, Italy and Spain. The permanent members of the Security Council—the U.S., Britain, France, Russia and China—have extraordinary power and can stop the expansion or addition of U.N. missions simply by voting no. The fact that they hold such power is the primary reason that they are expected to pay more for these missions and to deploy larger troop contingents.

European concerns go well beyond the matter of America's \$1.5-billion U.N. debt. One thing that most bothers our allies is the cynical American tendency to take advantage of the organization when it serves our national interest—as it did with Haiti—or to use it as an excuse to hide behind when it doesn't—Bosnia, for example.

This is not a debate about the \$4.40 that each American owes the U.N. but about the kind of world we want in the 21st century. Will it be one with the U.S. as the haughty and lonely superpower or one with nations and peoples following America's moral leadership and working out differences through dialogue, cooperation and common will, something very similar to what the U.N. is all about?●

#### THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF UNIROYAL GOODRICH PLANT IN TUSCALOOSA, AL

● Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I rise today in honor of the Uniroyal Goodrich Tire Manufacturing facility in Tuscaloosa, AL, which is celebrating its 50th year of successful production and community service. For half a century, the Uniroyal Goodrich plant has been an important part of Tuscaloosa's economic and social fabric as well as a source of great pride within the community.

For the last 50 years, the history of the Uniroyal Goodrich plant has reflected that of our Nation. In 1946, as our Nation was moving from wartime to a peacetime economy, BF Goodrich was leading the way, purchasing an unfinished tire plant from the Federal Government, and on October 23, 1946, rolling the first tire off the assembly line. Since then, a long series of ambitious modernizations and expansions have enabled the Tuscaloosa facility to keep pace with the constant business and technological innovations which have been the hallmark of American industry. Although Tuscaloosa's tire manufacturing plant began by producing belted bias tires in an 860,000-square-foot structure, today the facility is double its original size, 40 acres under one roof, and produces high performance radial tires 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.

America's post-war success, like the success of the Tuscaloosa facility, has been a product of teamwork. In 1986, BF Goodrich joined forces with the Uniroyal Co. to produce high-quality tires. In 1990, the Uniroyal Goodrich Tire Co. became part of Michelin North America. This new team promises to be a leader in American industry for many years to come.

The important role the Uniroyal Goodrich plant has played in the development of Tuscaloosa as a growing and prosperous community cannot be overstated. It is a rare Tuscaloosa family who does not have a father, son, brother, sister, or cousin who is a current or previous employee of the plant. The plant's first weekly payroll, back in 1946, was \$542.23 for 12 employees. This payroll has grown to over \$1.3 million for 2,000 hard-working local men and women. This income rolls over many times in the local economy, benefiting all of Tuscaloosa's businesses and individuals.

I am immensely grateful for, and proud of, the Uniroyal Goodrich Tire Manufacturing plant and the men and women who work hard there every day. On behalf of all Tuscaloosans, I would therefore like to congratulate the Uniroyal Goodrich Tire Manufacturing plant for 50 years of outstanding production and community service. I wish them another 50 years of success and prosperity.●

#### IF WE WERE SERIOUS

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, when Richard Darman served as The Office of Management and Budget Director, I sometimes disagreed with him; but I always had great respect for him.

He had an op-ed piece in The New York Times on September 1 that contains a great deal of common sense; and as we know, common sense is all too often the last thing that gets discussed during a political campaign.

He says correctly that we have to look at the entitlement picture. To pretend that we can balance the budget without looking at entitlements is living in a dream world, even if both political parties were not asking for tax cuts. The request for tax cuts simply compounds this problem.

Second, he suggests that we have to look at urban problems. If I can expand that to say we ought to be looking at the question of poverty, which is what he is really suggesting. That means looking at education and some other basics.

I have long favored having a WPA type of jobs program where we would pay people the minimum wage for 4-days a week. The fifth day they would have to be out trying to find a job in the private sector. When people cannot read and write, we would get them into a program. If their literacy and educational background was woefully inadequate, we would get them into a program to get their GED. If they have no marketable skill, we would get

them to a community college or technical school.

The reality is there is no way of achieving the kind of society we should have on the cheap, as Darman points out.

The third reality that he mentions in his article is that we are growing older and obviously that has a huge impact on the entitlement scene.

There is one other reality that he does not mention that ought to be put on the table and that is in terms of taxation. Contrary to the general myth, the percentage of our taxes that goes for government support is lower than any of the countries of western Europe or Japan, Australia, and New Zealand, if the Japanese industrial compact is considered. The lone exception to that is Turkey.

We ought to be looking at a value-added tax; we ought to be looking at a more realistic gasoline tax; we ought to be raising cigarette taxes, both for our economic health and our physical health.

In any event, the Darman discussion should move us a little more toward reality.

Mr. President, I ask that this article from The New York Times be printed in the RECORD.

The article follows:

[From the New York Times, Sept. 1, 1996]

IF WE WERE SERIOUS

(By Richard Darman)

The prime-time convention shows have come to their balloon-drop endings. The mini-movies, zingers and dramatic speeches are over. What follows now, we are told, is the "serious campaign."

That is a notion which many would dismiss as oxymoronic. But it has the virtue of suggesting an interesting question: What important issues might the candidates address if the campaign actually were serious?

The question is not put to dismiss what has been presented so far. Bill Clinton and Bob Dole have both recognized that a governing majority requires far broader appeal than either party's traditional base provides. They have both broadened their reach.

Bob Dole has distanced himself from the dour anti-government focus of the House Republicans by selecting Jack Kemp—signaling an interest in growth, while underlining his commitment to equal opportunity, inclusiveness and tolerance. Bill Clinton has adopted a Reaganesque command of symbols and ceremony, declaring "hope is back." And he has again reversed himself on welfare and taxes, asserting "the era of big government is over."

How much of this is to be taken seriously, others may judge. Choices have been framed: whether to continue on the current path or pursue a bolder reach for growth; to rely on government or "trust the people"; to "bridge" forward or back to the future. The problem is that such formulations, though important, are abstract. As presented by the major candidates, they barely touch fundamental issues America must face.

One such issue, growing middle-class entitlements, was mentioned in a convention speech, but not by any of the candidates. Colin Powell warned of "condemning our children and grandchildren with a crushing burden of debt that will deny them the American Dream." He noted, "We all need to understand it is the entitlement state that

must be reformed, and not just the welfare state." Virtually all serious analysts agree: if entitlements are not reformed before the baby-boom generation reaches age 60, the feel-good talk about recent progress on the deficit will be replaced by a sense of crisis.

The sensible course is to avoid a baby-boomer retirement shock by addressing the problem well in advance. But the major candidates either pretend the problem does not exist, propose to hand it to a commission, or wish it away with heroic assumptions about economic growth. Indeed, while sidestepping the problem, the candidates actually act as if government were going to be long, not short, on revenue. Without providing credible proposals for spending reduction, both candidates offer the voters attractive tax cuts—what Ross Perot has termed "free candy just before elections."

The facts are these, however: There are good reasons public policy should seek to increase growth. These range from interests in reducing the deficit and financing Social Security to increasing opportunity for the poor and improving the quality of life for all. But growth is limited by labor-force participation and the rate of increase in productivity. These can and should be improved by cutting marginal tax rates and the tax on capital gains. But significant improvements in productivity also require radical improvements in education and training, and major breakthroughs in research and development. These, in turn, require the expenditure of political and financial capital. Even with these, the likely increase in growth would not suffice to offset too much free candy.

In any case, major improvements in long-term productivity growth take time to achieve. Meanwhile, the deficit cannot be eliminated by focusing on non-entitlements and using the new line-item veto. The "anti-government" public and politicians care too much about expenditures for law enforcement, immigration control, drug abuse prevention, air safety, environmental protection, biomedical research, and so on. So if the baby-boomers are to avoid a shock, if the deficit is to be kept under control, and if a tax increase is to be avoided, entitlement reform will have to be faced promptly.

This issue is at the heart of the budget problem. Yet if it were merely budgetary, it would long since have been solved. The dilemma is that entitlements principally involve the broad American middle that is key to electoral success. That is why entitlements are the "third rail" of American politics and lend themselves to demagoguery. They are treated simplistically though they involve complex questions: Who in the middle class should be protected against exactly what risks? What should be the relative responsibility of government and individuals in assuring risk protection? What are the obligations of working generations to generations too young or too old to work? Leadership is needed to help frame responsible answers to just such difficult questions. Yet no candidate has trusted the people enough to risk a serious discussion.

A second fundamental problem is as obvious as the first and as unattended: America's deposing inner cities. Clearly, talk of hope, history and the American Dream is hollow if it does not address the large population trapped in ghettos. Urban ghettos represent a moral failure and a substantial economic cost. Indeed, if left unattended, the decivilizing effects of urban neglect may pose a more widespread threat to the American Dream. Yet this problem, too, has difficulty attracting a serious word.

Jack Kemp deserves credit for being among the few major politicians to put the urban problem on the national agenda. But, unfortunately, putting this problem on the agenda

and offering viable solutions are not necessarily the same. Jobs must be created near blighted areas, and tax incentives could help, but they cannot possibly suffice. A zero capital gains rate will not counter the fear of random violence or organized mayhem. Low marginal rates alone will not produce healthy role models or families, effective education, a reduction in drug abuse, or the basics of a civilized infrastructure. Given the scale of the urban problem, very large amounts of public and private investment are required. And while the investment may pay for itself over generations, in the near term it means that in addition to tax incentives there must be significant spending. Yet these days, no major politician seems willing to admit publicly that great dreams cannot be achieved on the cheap.

A third fundamental problem is not quite as obvious as the first two. It is the flip side of a good thing: Americans can expect to live longer. The Census Bureau estimates that, in 2010, there will be more than 40 million Americans aged 65 and over. Six million will be 85 and over—and that is before the baby-boomers reach 85. With breakthroughs in biomedical research, these numbers will be even more compelling. There is not only a very large generation headed toward retirement. But in the move from the 20th to the 21st century, something close to an additional generation is being added to expected life.

This will necessitate a minor cultural and economic revolution. It is not merely an issue of entitlement finance. Retirement ages will have to increase. Job and retraining opportunities will have to be developed. New community-living arrangements will have to be expanded. Profound issues of morality will have to be confronted.

Bob Dole has spoken eloquently of the "gracious compensations of age." At 73, he is healthy and active—a symbol of the enormous potential represented by the growing numbers of healthy older Americans. He is perfectly positioned to raise national consciousness about the risks and opportunities presented by the aging of America.

As the campaign moves into its "serious" phase, however, it may be naive to imagine that candidates might actually treat us as if we could face serious problems seriously. Bill Clinton has had four years to address these problems and has not yet done so. And while elections elicit new proposals, they rarely produce serious discussion. The politicians are, naturally enough, trying to get elected. To get them to be serious, we ourselves would have to be serious. And if balloons, simple nostrums and promises of free candy are all we demand, that is probably about all we will get. ●

#### TRIBUTE TO THE TOWN OF HOLLIS, NH, ON THE OCCASION OF THEIR 250TH ANNIVERSARY

● Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to the people of Hollis, NH, on their town's 250th anniversary. Since April, the residents of Hollis have been celebrating their town's anniversary with numerous festivities including the strawberry festival, a museum opening, a civic profile, a firemen's muster, an apple festival, a marathon road race and many other enjoyable events. The town's celebration on September 14th will mark their official 250th anniversary and is certain to bring the whole town together for this historic event.

The history of Hollis dates back to the year 1746 when the area of West

Dunstable was divided into four different parts—Dunstable, Monson, Merrimack, and Hollis. Later on April 3, 1746, then-Governor Benning Wentworth signed the town's first charter officially naming the town Hollis. It was on this date that the people from a loose settlement of families gathered under one wing of a church in the Hollis area to join together to unite their town.

Originally, Hollis was granted the name of Hollis after Governor Wentworth's friend, the Duke of Newcastle. Eventually, the town residents changed the spelling of Hollis to Hollis in honor of an English merchant they admired for his high level of intellect and his generosity to Harvard College. Many descendants of the town's first settlers still live in Hollis today. Before the signing of the charter, there were 75 families that resided in the geographical location of Hollis. When the charter was signed, 20 families were forced to reside in the Dunstable area. These 20 families fought for 30 years to be reunited with their fellow neighbors and their home, Hollis. To this day, the residents of Hollis use this example as an illustration of their town's commitment of unity.

The passage of 250 years of history has changed the way of life for the people of Hollis. Some of the minor changes include the tithing men and fence viewers who have disappeared from election ballots and the decay of the whipping post in the town common. Nevertheless, these few minor changes have not changed the bond the families feel for Hollis, nor the civic responsibilities they have held in the town since 1746. Joan Tinklepaugh, who wrote a history for the town, states it best when she says, "we are all joined together by the stitches of the quilt of humanity that makes up the town called Hollis."

I congratulate the many residents of Hollis on this festive occasion, and for their sense of unity and dedication. Enjoy the celebration and may the years to come be as prosperous as your last 250 years. Happy birthday Hollis. ●

#### ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 12, 1996

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until the hour of 9:30 a.m. on Thursday, September 12; further, that immediately following the prayer, the Journal of proceedings be deemed approved to date, the morning hour be deemed to have expired, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, the Senate immediately resume consideration of the Treasury-postal appropriations bill, and further there be 15 minutes of debate equally divided in the usual form in regard to the pending amendments offered by Senators HATCH and REID. I further ask that prior to the second vote there be 2 minutes of debate equally divided.